and (c) as the acts complained of arose in this district.

2

3

4 5

7 8

9 10

11 12

13

14

16 17

18

20 21

22

23 24

25

26 27

28

PARTIES

- At all times herein mentioned, plaintiff, Kevin Highsmith ("Highsmith") 3. was, and now is, a citizen of the United States, and resides in the State of California. At the time of the incident described herein, Highsmith was an inmate in the California Department of Corrections being held at California State Prison, Los Angeles County, in Lancaster California at all relevant times mentioned herein.
- At all times herein mentioned, defendant, Correctional Officer Lidia Marquez (Badge No. 67891), was duly appointed and acting as a correctional officer, acting under color of state law at California State Prison, Los Angeles. She is sued in her individual capacity and was at all material times acting under color of State law and as the employee, agent and representative of every other defendant.
- At all times herein mentioned, defendant, Correctional Officer Jose 5. Arroyo (Badge No. 60749), was duly appointed and acting as a correctional officer, acting under color of state law at California State Prison, Los Angeles. He is sued in his individual capacity and was at all material times acting under color of State law and as the employee, agent and representative of every other defendant.
- At all times herein mentioned, defendant, Correctional Officer Rudy 6. Esparza (Badge No. 60132), was duly appointed and acting as a correctional officer, acting under color of state law at California State Prison, Los Angeles. He is sued in his individual capacity and was at all material times acting under color of State law and as the employee, agent and representative of every other defendant.
- At all times herein mentioned, defendant, Correctional Officer Frank 7. Garcia (Badge No. 51880), was duly appointed and acting as a correctional officer, acting under color of state law at California State Prison, Los Angeles. He is sued in his individual capacity and was at all material times acting under color of State law and as the employee, agent and representative of every other defendant.
 - At all times herein mentioned, defendant, Correctional Officer 8.

- Christopher. Geiwitz (Badge No. 61985), was duly appointed and acting as a correctional officer, acting under color of state law at California State Prison, Los Angeles. He is sued in his individual capacity and was at all material times acting under color of State law and as the employee, agent and representative of every other defendant.
- 9. At all times herein mentioned, defendant, Correctional Officer Sgt. Joe Lopez (Badge No. 62067), was duly appointed and acting as a correctional officer, acting under color of state law at California State Prison, Los Angeles. He is sued in his individual capacity and was at all material times acting under color of State law and as the employee, agent and representative of every other defendant.
- 10. At all times herein mentioned, defendant, Correctional Officer Standish Berry (Badge No. 67161), was duly appointed and acting as a correctional officer, acting under color of state law at California State Prison, Los Angeles. He is sued in his individual capacity and was at all material times acting under color of State law and as the employee, agent and representative of every other defendant.
- 11. At all times herein mentioned, defendant, Correctional Officer Carlos Mancilla (Badge No. 49786), was duly appointed and acting as a correctional officer, acting under color of state law at California State Prison, Los Angeles. He is sued in his individual capacity and was at all material times acting under color of State law and as the employee, agent and representative of every other defendant.
- 12. At all times herein mentioned, defendant, Correctional Officer Robert Pratt (Badge No. 63550), was duly appointed and acting as a correctional officer, acting under color of state law at California State Prison, Los Angeles. He is sued in his individual capacity and was at all material times acting under color of State law and as the employee, agent and representative of every other defendant.
- 13. At all times herein mentioned, defendant, Correctional Officer J. Curiel, was duly appointed and acting as a correctional officer, acting under color of state law at California State Prison, Los Angeles. He is sued in his individual capacity and

- 14. At all times herein mentioned, defendants, Does I through X were duly appointed and acting as agents of the State of California employed as such by the California Department of Corrections or contracting with that agency and were at all material times acting under color of State law and as the employee, agent and representative of every other defendant. These DOES are sued in their individual capacity.
- 15. The true names or capacities of defendants, Does I through X are unknown to plaintiff who therefore sues such defendants by such fictitious names. Each of the defendant Does is responsible in some manner for the events herein referred to, and caused injuries and damages proximately thereby to plaintiff, as herein alleged. Plaintiff will amend this complaint to insert the true names and capacities of the fictitiously named defendants when ascertained.

FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS

Angeles, was lying on his bunk (17 Low, in D-Yard Gym) adjusting his clothing while most of the other inmates were recreating outside the D-Yard Gym. At this time defendant Marquez observed this conduct and knowingly falsely accused the Plaintiff of engaging in sexual misconduct toward her. Marquez notified defendant Geiwitz of the false allegation of sexual misconduct toward her and he (Geiwitz) approached Plaintiff and handcuffed him, on information and belief, knowing that the allegations were false. With the knowledge of Geiwitz (on information and belief), Defendants Arroyo and Esparza took Plaintiff to a secluded rotunda area out of view of other officers and inmates and out of view of all video surveillance cameras. They were joined by defendants Garcia and Pratt. During these times Plaintiff was beaten, kicked and thrown to the ground by these defendants in retaliation for the false allegations made by Marquez. On information and belief, Arroyo and Esparza

- 17. During this time, the D-Yard Program Sergeant, defendant Lopez was notified of what was occurring and participated in the "informal" discipline and punishment of Plaintiff. Defendant Lopez engaged in the investigation of th incident and, on information and belief, knew that the wrong had occurred, yet he also participated in covering up the misconduct. The defendant correctional officers, in using the force against Plaintiff did so actively, through a conspiracy or tacit agreement of a code of silence, or through a custom and practice of covering for one another and meting out informal discipline which amounted to cruel and unusual punishment. The force and punishment was applied maliciously and sadistically for the very purpose of causing harm and engaging in unlawful and unjustified punishment of Plaintiff. Thereafter, claimant was denied appropriate medical treatment for his injuries.
- punishment and illegal application of force, the officers, as a pretext claimed that he was engaged in illegal "sexual" activity to embarrass him and to ensure that he not come forward with the complaint. Additionally, the officers falsely claimed that Plaintiff had resisted and used force against the officers. This was a pretext designed to discourage Plaintiff from telling the truth and to cover their own misconduct. Further, Plaintiff was the subject of disciplinary and criminal prosecution for the alleged sexual misconduct and for using force or violence against the officers. Those charges of sexual misconduct and use of force or violence against the officer

defendants were dismissed against Plaintiff in the court. Any verdict in this case would not be inconsistent with and state court judgment in the criminal case. Plaintiff was punished by placement in administrative segregation and deprived of credits toward his release as a result of the fabrications made by the officer defendants. All of the defendants conspired either overtly or discretely to deprive Plaintiff of his rights by committing the misconduct identified herein.

- 19. By reason of the afore described acts of defendants, plaintiff suffered punitive additional time in custody, physical injuries, pain and suffering, emotional distress, and was otherwise injured, subjected to humiliation and indignities, and suffered physical, mental and emotional pain and suffering all to his damage in an amount to be ascertained.
- 20. Defendants, and each of them, knew or should have known that the placement of Plaintiff in disciplinary housing was only a pretext to cover up their illegal actions. The discipline imposed on plaintiff was unjustified and imposed to discredit the plaintiff and prevent him from pursuing any claim.
- 21. Defendants, and each of them, knew or should have known that the placement of Plaintiff in disciplinary housing was only a pretext to cover up their illegal actions. The discipline imposed on plaintiff was unjustified and imposed to discredit the plaintiff and prevent him from pursuing any claim.
- 22. Plaintiff did not consent to this conduct but protested until he was overcome by the defendants unlawful punishment and use of force. The unlawful punishment and use of force upon plaintiff was cruel, unusual, unjustified, unreasonable, excessive and beyond any need the officers knew they had.
- 23. The aforementioned acts of defendants, and each of them, were willful, reckless, malicious, oppressive, and with callous indifference to and with reckless disregard to plaintiff's rights, and thus, justify awarding of exemplary and punitive damages in an amount to be ascertained according to proof at the time of trial.
 - 24. Plaintiff exhausted his administrative remedies by filing the necessary

2

3

4

5

8

10

11

12

13

14

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

documentation with the CDC in order to process his appeals and complaints. Alternatively and additionally, during the course of his processing of his administrative remedies, Plaintiff's attempts to exhaust his administrative remedies was continuously interfered with by Defendant J. Curiel. Defendant, J. Curiel, continually discouraged Plaintiff from filing his appeals and exhausting his remedies and took action which interfered with and, interrupted, discouraged, blocked, and generally prevented Plaintiff from exhausting his administrative remedies. On information and belief, defendant J. Curiel and certain DOES understood and/or believed that the PLRA required administrative exhaustion and each of them took steps to prevent exhaustion so as to avoid, illegally, litigation and to cover up the misconduct by his fellow CDC employees and correctional officers. The aforementioned conduct also caused Plaintiff not to be able to complete the exhaustion of his administrative remedies by the time he was released from prison on July 23, 2008. At the time of the filing of this complaint, Plaintiff is and was not a prisoner confined in any jail, prison, or other correctional facility. The aforementioned acts of interference by defendants J. Curiel and certain unknown DOE defendants, and each of them, constituted conduct which violated Plaintiff's due process and equal protection rights.

25. Alternatively, the aforementioned acts of defendants, and each of them, constituted conduct which does not involve "prison conditions," but involves a particular incident whereby the defendants engaged in illegal and unlawful conduct. Additionally, requiring any such exhaustion is futile, since this suit does not seek to improve prison conditions as defined under the Prison Litigation Reform Act, and no exhaustion could allow the prison officials to remedy the condition or resolve the dispute during or subsequent to any such process. Further, Plaintiff was released from prison while he was engaging the administrative remedies, but could not longer do so by virtue of his release. As such exhaustion is not required under 42 U.S.C. § 1997e(a).

26.

defendants of a reasonable sum for attorney's fees pursuant to 42 U.S.C. Section 1988.

COUNT ONE

By reason of the afore described acts and omissions of defendants,

plaintiff was required to retain an attorney to institute, prosecute and render legal

assistance to plaintiff in the within action so that he might vindicate the loss and

impairment of plaintiff's rights. By reason thereof, plaintiff requests payment by

(Against All Defendants and DOES I-X, For Violation of Civil Rights— Use of Force Constituting Cruel and Unusual Punishment)

- 27. Plaintiff hereby incorporates and realleges Paragraphs 1 through 26 hereat as though fully set forth at this place.
- 28. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereon alleges, that all of the acts, as alleged herein above, were done in a conspiracy, either overtly or tacitly, and/or through the individual acts of defendants.
- 29. By reason of all defendants' conduct, plaintiff was deprived of rights, privileges, and immunities secured to him by the Eighth and Fourteenth Amendments of the Constitutional of the United States and the laws enacted thereunder. The Eighth Amendment prohibition of cruel and unusual punishment is applicable to the states and its officers through the Fourteenth Amendment. The unlawful use of force, and fabrication of events amounted to an arbitrary intrusion by defendants, and each of them, into the security of plaintiff's rights, in violation of his constitutionally protected rights and constituted cruel and unusual punishment, and were not authorized by law. The violence inflicted upon plaintiff's person, the restriction of his movements, and the use of force deprived plaintiff of his right to be free from cruel and unusual punishment under the Eighth Amendment as applied to these defendants through the Fourteenth Amendment's right to due process of law.
- 30. The Defendants knew or should have known when they took the action against this Plaintiff that Plaintiff would have been subjected to the infliction of

- 9 10
- 11 12
- 13
- 14 15
- 16 17
- 18
- 19
- 20 21

22

23

24

25

26

27 28 unnecessary and wanton pain. The Defendants were deliberately indifferent to Plaintiff's constitutional right to be free of cruel and unusual punishment because they committed the acts alleged herein and intentionally interfered with Plaintiff's right to be free from cruel and unusual punishment. Such acts violated Plaintiff's constitutional right to be free from cruel and unusual punishment, and the Defendants' conduct was the proximate cause of injury and consequent damage to the Plaintiff.

- The acts of defendants, and each of them, to deprive plaintiff of his right to liberty was in deliberate indifference and conscious disregard to plaintiff's constitutional rights. Therefore, defendants, and each of them, are liable under 42 U.S.C. §1983.
- The aforementioned acts of defendants, and each of them, were willful, 32. reckless, malicious, oppressive, and with callous indifference to and with reckless disregard to plaintiff's rights, and thus, justify awarding of exemplary and punitive damages in an amount to be ascertained according to proof at the time of trial.
- By reason of the afore described acts and omissions of defendants, plaintiff was required to retain an attorney to institute, prosecute and render legal assistance to plaintiff in the within action so that he might vindicate the loss and impairment of plaintiff's rights. By reason thereof, plaintiff requests payment by defendants of a reasonable sum for attorney's fees pursuant to 42 U.S.C. Section 1988.

COUNT TWO

(Against All Defendants and DOES I-X,

For Violation of Civil Rights-Abuse of Process and Malicious Prosecution)

- Plaintiff hereby incorporates and realleges Paragraphs 1 through 33 34. hereat as though fully set forth at this place.
- Plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereon alleges, that all of the 35. acts, as alleged herein above, were done in a conspiracy, either overtly or tacitly, and/or through the individual acts of defendants.

37. The Defendants knew or should have known when they took the action against this Plaintiff that Plaintiff would have been subjected to the infliction of unnecessary and wanton pain. The Defendants were deliberately indifferent to Plaintiff's constitutional right to be free of cruel and unusual punishment because they committed the acts alleged herein and intentionally interfered with Plaintiff's right to be free from cruel and unusual punishment. Such acts violated Plaintiff's constitutional right to be free from cruel and unusual punishment, and the Defendants' conduct was the proximate cause of injury and consequent damage to the Plaintiff.

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

Therefore, defendants, and each of them, are liable under 42 U.S.C. §1983.

- 38. The acts of defendants, and each of them, independent of any Eighth Amendment claim, operated also to deprive plaintiff of his rights to due process of law under the Fourteenth and Fourth Amendments and was done in deliberate indifference and conscious disregard to plaintiff's constitutional rights. Therefore, defendants, and each of them, are liable under 42 U.S.C. §1983.
- 39. The aforementioned acts of defendants, and each of them, were willful, reckless, malicious, oppressive, and with callous indifference to and with reckless disregard to plaintiff's rights, and thus, justify awarding of exemplary and punitive damages in an amount to be ascertained according to proof at the time of trial.
- 40. By reason of the afore described acts and omissions of defendants, plaintiff was required to retain an attorney to institute, prosecute and render legal assistance to plaintiff in the within action so that he might vindicate the loss and impairment of plaintiff's rights. By reason thereof, plaintiff requests payment by defendants of a reasonable sum for attorney's fees pursuant to 42 U.S.C. Section 1988.

COUNT THREE

(Against All Defendants and DOES I-X,

For Violation of Civil Rights-Deliberate Indifference to Medical Needs)

- 41. Plaintiff hereby incorporates and realleges Paragraphs 1 through 39 hereat as though fully set forth at this place.
- 42. Subsequent to the events alleged herein, the Defendants also denied Plaintiff needed medical treatment by being deliberately indifferent to his serious medical needs after he was beaten. Defendants knew or should have known that Plaintiff had a serious medical need which required appropriate treatment, and that failure to treat such medical need would result in the infliction of unnecessary and wanton pain and/or the exacerbation of other painful medical conditions.
 - 43. Defendants were deliberately indifferent to Plaintiff's constitutional right

to be free of cruel and unusual punishment because they denied, delayed or intentionally interfered with medical treatment. Such acts violated Plaintiff's constitutional right to be free from <u>cruel</u> and unusual punishment. The Defendants' conduct was the proximate cause of injury and consequent damage to the Plaintiff.

- 44. The prison officials (defendants in this action) committed acts which resulted in the denial, delay and/or intentional interference with the medical treatment needed by Plaintiff and the manner in which the prison physicians and or representatives provided medical care was a violation of Plaintiff's rights as well. The deliberate indifference to serious medical needs existed, in part, when these defendants failed to provide medical care when he knew or should have known that such omission will result in the infliction of unnecessary and wanton pain.
- 45. The aforementioned acts of defendants, and each of them, were willful, reckless, malicious, oppressive, and with callous indifference to and with reckless disregard to plaintiff's rights, and thus, justify awarding of exemplary and punitive damages in an amount to be ascertained according to proof at the time of trial.
- 46. By reason of the afore described acts and omissions of defendants, plaintiff was required to retain an attorney to institute, prosecute and render legal assistance to plaintiff in the within action so that he might vindicate the loss and impairment of plaintiff's rights. By reason thereof, plaintiff requests payment by the defendants and each of them his attorneys' fees and costs as appropriate under 42 U.S.C. section 1988 or any other appropriate authority.

COUNT FOUR

(Against All Defendants and DOES I-X,

For Violation of Civil Rights-Due Process, Equal Protection, and Violation of Right to Petition the Government for Redress of Grievances

47. Plaintiff hereby incorporates and realleges Paragraphs 1 through 46 hereat as though fully set forth at this place.

12

20 21

22

18

19

23 24

26 27

28

- Subsequent to the events alleged herein, the Defendants also denied 48. Plaintiff his due process and equal protection rights by delaying, interfering, discouraging, impeding, and otherwise obstructing Plaintiffs need to exhaust his administrative remedies. Defendants knew or should have known that Plaintiff was required to exhaust his remedies and they took action to interfere with that requirement that he exhaust his remedies. Defendant J. Curiel took the action on behalf of the other defendants as part of a plan to impeded Plaintiff's ability to remedy the wrongs alleged herein that had been done to him in order to prevent Plaintiff from getting proper redress of his grievances. The defense knew that the actions taken would result in a denial of his rights.
- Defendants were deliberately indifferent to Plaintiff's constitutional right 49. to be free of cruel and unusual punishment as detailed herein. Defendants also knew that the because they attempted to and did deny, delay or intentionally interfere and impede Plaintiff's attempts to exhaust his remedies, that this would assist defendants in covering up their illegal activity and protecting themselves from being discovered. Such acts violated Plaintiff's constitutional rights to petition the government for redress, due process, and equal protection. The Defendants' conduct was the proximate cause of injury and consequent damage to the Plaintiff.
- The prison officials (defendants in this action) committed acts which 50. resulted in the denial, delay and/or intentional interference with the Plaintiffs attempts and ultimate success in denying Plaintiff the right to exhaust his remedies before his release from prison. The deliberate indifference to these rights
- The aforementioned acts of defendants, and each of them, were willful, 51. reckless, malicious, oppressive, and with callous indifference to and with reckless disregard to plaintiffs rights, and thus, justify awarding of exemplary and punitive damages in an amount to be ascertained according to proof at the time of trial.
- By reason of the afore described acts and omissions of defendants, plaintiff was required to retain an attorney to institute, prosecute and render legal

FOR THE CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

KEVIN HIGHSMITH,

Plaintiff,

v.

LIDIA MARQUEZ, in her individual capacity; JOSE ARROYO, in her individual capacity; RUDY ESPARZA, in | his individual capacity; FRANK GARCIA, in his individual capacity; CHRISTOPHER GEIWITZ, in his individual capacity; SGT. JOE LOPEZ, in his individual capacity; STANDISH BERRY in his individual capacity; CARLOS MANCILLA in his individual capacity; ROBERT PRATT in his individual capacity; J. CURIEL, in his individual capacity, and DOES I through X. inclusive.

Defendants.

CASE NUMBER

CV09-00039 SVW (CTx)

SUMMONS

TO THE ABOVE-NAMED DEFENDANT(S), you are hereby summoned and required to Plaintiff's attorney, whose address is: file with this court and serve upon

> Patrick S. Smith, Esq. BELTRAN BELTRAN SMITH OPPEL & MACKENZIE, LLP 16133 Ventura Blvd., Suite 1145 Encino, California 91436

an answer to the complaint which is herewith served upon you within 20 days after service of this summons upon you, exclusive of the day of service. If you fail to do so, judgment by default will be taken against you for the relief demanded in the complaint.

DATED: JAN - 5 2009

CLERK, U. S. DISTRICT COURT

NATALIE LONGORIA

DEPUTA

(SEAL 🗗

SUMMONS

 $By_{\underline{}}$

CV-01A (01/01)

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

NOTICE OF ASSIGNMENT TO UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE FOR DISCOVERY

This case has been assigned to District Judge Stephen V. Wilson and the assigned discovery Magistrate Judge is Carolyn Turchin.

The case number on all documents filed with the Court should read as follows:

CV09- 39 SVW (CTx)

Pursuant to General Order 05-07 of the United States District Court for the Central District of California, the Magistrate Judge has been designated to hear discovery related motions.

All discovery related motions should be noticed on the calendar of the Magistrate Judge
==================================
NOTICE TO COUNSEL

A copy of this notice must be served with the summons and complaint on all defendants (if a removal action is filed, a copy of this notice must be served on all plaintiffs).

Subsequent documents must be filed at the following location:

312 N	ern Division [_] I. Spring St., Rm. G-8 Angeles, CA 90012	Southern Division 411 West Fourth St., Rm. 1-053 Santa Ana, CA 92701-4516	, Ц	Eastern Division 3470 Twelfth St., Rm. 134 Riverside, CA 92501
-------	---	---	-----	--

Failure to file at the proper location will result in your documents being returned to you.

Case 2:09-cv-00039-PA-SH Document 1 Filed 01/05/09 Page 17 of 18 Page ID #:17 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT, CENTRAL DISTRICT CALIFORNIA CIVIL COVER SHEET

		CIVILLOU	EKSIMET			
I (a) PLAINTIFFS (Check box KEVIN HIGHSMITH	if you are representing yourself □)		DEFENDANTS LIDIA MARQUEZ, in her individual capacity; JOSE ARROYO, in her individual capacity; RUDY ESPARZA, in his individual capacity; FRANK GARCIA, in his individual capacity; et al.			
(b) County of Residence of First Los Angeles	t Listed Plaintiff (Except in U.S. Plai	intiff Cases):	County of Residence of First Listed Defendant (In U.S. Plaintiff Cases Only):			
(c) Attorneys (Firm Name, Add yourself, provide same.)	dress and Telephone Number. If you	are representing	Attorneys (If Known)			
PATRÍCK S. SMITH (SMITH OPPEL & MACKENZ uite 1145	IE, L.L.P.	Edmund G. Brown, Attorney General of the State of California Mitchell E. Rische, Deputy Attorney General 300 South Spring Street, Suite 1702 Los Angeles, California 90013			
II. BASIS OF JURISDICTION	N (Place an X in one box only.)	III. CITIZEN	NSHIP OF PRINCIPAL PART X in one box for plaintiff and o	TES - For Diversity Cases ne for defendant.)	Only	
☐ 1 U.S. Government Plaintiff	√3 Federal Question (U.S. Government Not a Party)	Citizen of Thi		DEF ☐ 1 Incorporated or Proof Business in this		
☐ 2 U.S. Government Defendant	t	ship Citizen of And	other State 2	2 Incorporated and of Business in An		
		Citizen or Sub	ject of a Foreign Country 3	3 Foreign Nation	□6 □6	
IV. ORIGIN (Place an X in on	e box only.)					
Original 2 Remove State Co		4 Reinstated or E Reopened	15 Transferred from another dis	trict (specify): 6 Multi Distr Litig	ict Judge from	
V. REQUESTED IN COMPLA	AINT: JURY DEMAND: Yes	s 👿 No (Check 'Y	'es' only if demanded in compla	int.)		
CLASS ACTION under F.R.C.	.P. 23: □ Yes 🖼 No	5	MONEY DEMANDED IN C	OMPLAINT: \$ Not yet	ascertained	
VI. CAUSE OF ACTION (Cite the U.S. Civil Statute under which you are filing and write a brief statement of cause. Do not cite jurisdictional statutes unless diversity.) 42 USC 1983 claim for violation of civil rights						
VII. NATURE OF SUIT (Place	te an X in one box only.)				The state of the s	
©UHER STATUTES	GONERAGE	PERSONAL INJU		PRISONIA	ABOR ☐ 710 Fair Labor Standards Act	
☐ 410 Antitrust ☐ 430 Banks and Banking] 310 Airplane] 315 Airplane Pro-	PROPERTY duct □ 370 Other Fraud	☐ 510 Motions to Vacate Sentence	720 Labor/Mgmt.	
☐ 450 Commerce/ICC	☐ 140 Negotiable Instrument	Liability	☐ 371 Truth in Lending		Relations	
Rates/etc. 460 Deportation	☐ 150 Recovery of Overpayment &	320 Assault, Libe Slander	21 & □ 380 Other Personal	☐ 530 General ☐ 535 Death Penalty	☐ 730 Labor/Mgmt. Reporting &	
☐ 470 Racketeer Influenced		330 Fed. Employ	ers' 385 Property Damage	□ 540 Mandamus/	Disclosure Act	
and Corrupt	Judgment	Liability	Product Liability BANKER PICY	Other 550 Civil Rights	☐ 740 Railway Labor Act ☐ 790 Other Labor	
Organizations ☐ 480 Consumer Credit] 340 Marine] 345 Marine Prod		☐ 555 Prison Condition	1	
☐ 490 Cable/Sat TV	Student Loan (Excl.	Liability	158	FORBEHTURE /	☐ 791 Empl. Ret. Inc. Security Act	
☐ 810 Selective Service ☐ 850 Securities/Commodities	·	☐ 350 Motor Vehic ☐ 355 Motor Vehic		PENALTY G 610 Agriculture	PROPERTY RIGHTS	
/Exchange	Overpayment of	Product Liab	oility CIVIL RIGHTS	☐ 620 Other Food &	820 Copyrights	
☐ 875 Customer Challenge 12		360 Other Persor	nal ☐ 441 Voting ☐ 442 Employment	Drug ☐ 625 Drug Related	☐ 830 Patent ☐ 840 Trademark	
USC 3410 ☐ 890 Other Statutory Actions	☐ 160 Stockholders' Suits ☐ 190 Other Contract ☐	Injury ∃362 Personal Inje		Seizure of	SOCIAL SECURITY	
☐ 891 Agricultural Act	☐ 195 Contract Product	Med Malpra	ctice mmodations	Property 21 USC		
☐ 892 Economic Stabilization	Liability ☐ 196 Franchise	365 Personal Inju Product Lial		881 ☐ 630 Liquor Laws	☐ 862 Black Lung (923) ☐ 863 DIWC/DIWW	
Act ☐ 893 Environmental Matters		368 Asbestos Pe	· •	☐ 640 R.R. & Truck	(405(g))	
☐ 894 Energy Allocation Act	☐ 210 Land Condemnation	Injury Produ		☐ 650 Airline Regs	□ 864 SSID Title XVI	
☐ 895 Freedom of Info. Act☐ 900 Appeal of Fee Determi-	☐ 220 Foreclosure ☐ 230 Rent Lease & Ejectment	Liability	☐ 446 American with Disabilities -	☐ 660 Occupational Safety /Health	☐ 865 RSI (405(g)) PEDERAL PAX SUHS	
nation Under Equal	240 Torts to Land		Other	☐ 690 Other	☐ 870 Taxes (U.S. Plaintiff	
Access to Justice	☐ 245 Tort Product Liability		440 Other Civil	1	or Defendant) ☐ 871 IRS-Third Party 26	
☐ 950 Constitutionality of State Statutes	290 All Other Real Property		Rights		USC 7609	
VIII(a). IDENTICAL CASES: Has this action been previously filed and dismissed, remanded or closed? \(\sigma\) No \(\sigma'\) Yes						
If yes, list case number(s): CV 08-04477 PA (SHx)						
FOR OFFICE USE ONLY:	Case Number:	19-11	111127	^		

CV-71 (07/05)

CIVIL COVER SHEET

Page 1 of 2

Case 2:09-cv-00039-PA-SH Document 1 Filed 01/05/09 Page 18 of 18 Page ID #:18 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT, CENTRAL DISTRICT CALIFORNIA CIVIL COVER SHEET

AFTER COMPLETING THE FRONT SIDE OF FORM CV-71, COMPLETE THE INFORMATION REQUESTED BELOW.

VIII(b). RELATED CASES: Have any cases been previously filed that are related to the present case? No Yes							
If yes, list case	number(s): CV 08-0	4477 PA (SHx)					
Civil cases are (Check all box	tes that apply) ☑A. ☑B.	ated if a previously filed case and the present case:					
IX. VENUE: ☐ Check here Los Ange	if the U.S. governmen	anty, or State if other t t, its agencies or empl	than California, in which EACH named plaintiff resides (Use an additional sheet if necessary) loyees is a named plaintiff.				
☐ Check her	omia County, or State i re if the U.S. governme eles (on information	ent, its agencies or em	a, in which EACH named defendant resides. (Use an additional sheet if necessary). ployees is a named defendant				
List the Calli Note: In land Los Ang	condemnation cases, u	te if other than Califouse the location of the	rnia, in which EACH claim arose. (Use an additional sheet if necessary) tract of land involved.				
X. SIGNAT	URE OF ATTORNE	Y (OR PRO PER):	Date Janaury 2, 2009				
Notice t	to Counsel/Parties: 7	The CV-71 (JS-44) Ci	vil Cover Sheet and the information contained herein neither replace nor supplement the filing and service of pleadings oved by the Judicial Conference of the United States in September 1974, is required pursuant to Local Rule 3-1 is not rpose of statistics, venue and initiating the civil docket sheet. (For more detailed instructions, see separate instructions				
Vary to Static	tical codes relating to	Social Security Cases					
Key w build	Nature of Suit Code		Substantive Statement of Cause of Action				
	861	НІА	All claims for health insurance benefits (Medicare) under Title 18, Part A, of the Social Security Act, as amended. Also, include claims by hospitals, skilled nursing facilities, etc., for certification as providers of services under the program. (42 U.S.C. 1935FF(b))				
	862	BL	All claims for "Black Lung" benefits under Title 4, Part B, of the Federal Coal Mine Health and Safety Act of 1969. (30 U.S.C. 923)				
	863	DIWC	All claims filed by insured workers for disability insurance benefits under Title 2 of the Social Security Act, as amended; plus all claims filed for child's insurance benefits based on disability. (42 U.S.C. 405(g))				
	863	DIWW	All claims filed for widows or widowers insurance benefits based on disability under Title 2 of the Social Security Act, as amended. (42 U.S.C. 405(g))				
	864	SSID	All claims for supplemental security income payments based upon disability filed under Title 16 of the Social Security Act, as amended.				
	865	RSI	All claims for retirement (old age) and survivors benefits under Title 2 of the Social Security Act, as amended. (42				